MODERN DEMOCRACY.

THE EXTENSION OF SLAVERY IN OUR OWN TERRITORY OR BY THE ACQUISITION OF FOREIGN TERRITORY WRONG MORALLY, POLITICALLY, AND ECONOMICALLY.

C
E45
M57
1860
LIBRARY

SPEECH

OF

HON. JUSTIN S. MORRILL, OF VERMONT.

Delivered in the U. S. House of Representatives, June 6, 1860.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: The struggles of men in power to maintain their positions—to cling to the sceptre—have been marked in all history. The genial robes of office cannot be torn from men long in public stations without seeming rudeness, if not actual violence. The petty constable, defeated at the last election, lingers at Helena with *his* disease of the heart, as much as Napoleon himself. Louis Philippe departs from Versailles with no more reluctance than John Tyler from Washington. Men in office seldom retire but on compulsion. Parties do not submit to ostracism without a contest. In France, such epochs are the mile-stones of revolution. In England, the struggle is not so convulsive, but there the tenacity of life among placemen is tough and unyielding. Neither Sir Robert Peel nor Lord North, neither Wellington nor Palmerston, quit their posts without a lingering look behind. They have dissolutions of Parliaments, fierce agitation, and monster meetings, but at last they yield to the popular wish of the nation, and with no unpatriotic attempt to break their fall by pulling down the glories of their empire.

In our own country, the bitterness of party warfare is proverbial and quadrennial, and within a few years the motto has been to give no quarter. "To the victors belong the spoils," and the vanquished "have no rights which white men are bound to respect." Such being the fate of defeated parties, it is not surprising that it should not be contemplated with complacency, and explains much of the ferocity which conspires the ruin of the reputation of opposing party organizations and party men, rather than accept the doom which awaits defeat. In such a warfare, the soldiers of greatest audacity in consistent and persistent slander become entitled to the places and pensions of the highest grade. The Democratic party, deeply skilled in this low art of political war, have drawn their subsistence so long from the National Treasury, that, when it seems imperilled, it is construed into an invasion of vested rights, and they declare their readiness to deny their allegiance to the Union so soon as their services shall be declined by a majority of the people. Democratic theory is constitutional and conservative while it contributes to the ascendency of a particular dynasty; but if, by the same legal processes, another party or set of men is inaugurated, it becomes fanatical, an open and palpable violation of constitutional rights; and, in short, a despotism to be resisted by all the grave responsibilities of a revolution.

The Democratic party, from its long continuance in office, puts forth the claim of absolutism and hereditary succession, and knows not how else to obtain a livelihood. It rather fears the alternative of a fair day's work for a fair day's pay. It clings to legitimacy of Democratic office-holding, and sanctions the doctrine that the Democratic party can do no wrong. The loss of office, like the loss of aristocratic appendages by the old French nobility, drives modern Democracy to the brink of despair and terrible gesticulation.

A party like this, it is evident, has outlived its usefulness, and cannot retain the confidence of freemen. Having lost the moral support of the country, it has propped itself up and maintained a hobbling existence by an unexampled abuse of the public patronage. At last, it is even false to itself, and has not that honor left which usually enables even the most reckless men to agree upon a division of spoils.

A party which has no philosophy which binds it to its own record from one year to the next, will not only relax from the traditions of our

forefathers, but will soon come to reject the maxims of those who founded the party itself. The paternity of the Democratic party clearly belongs to Thomas Jefferson, and yet those who still rally under the Democratic name have lost all trace of the leading principles of his statesmanship, and reject the care of his reputation as a burden. Living for a different result, they will not be embarrassed by his means. Though clinging to the party he organized, they marshal its forces to defeat his avowed objects and noblest purposes. Democracy, at its birth, had faith in the people; now, in its gray-hair-hood, it has faith only in the conservatism of a judiciary elected for life, and in a nationality represented by slavery. Rejecting the whole political gospel according to Jefferson, they have only *not* rejected the five loaves and two small fishes.

After three-fourths of a century, the expectations of the framers of our Government concerning slavery have been sadly disappointed. Their action was based upon the idea of leaving nothing upon the record incongruous with ultimate and universal emancipation. In future ages, our Constitution was to reveal no trace of an institution at war with its preamble—the Declaration of Independence. The symmetry of our theory was to have been sustained by our practice. Our history was to have been heroic, and without a page to blot. But the ever-increasing demand of the world for that wondrous and beautiful staple, cotton, whose remunerative culture was so suddenly and greatly increased by the inventive genius of Whitney, has made slave labor profitable, and both political and moral ethics must give way to the material interests thus stimulated. Conscience is drowned by the popular voice of thrift.

In the early history of our country, the extension of slavery was neither deemed right nor politic. It was both wrong and inexpedient. All the territory then belonging to the Union, therefore, was made secure against slavery or involuntary servitude, except for crime. At a later period, when free labor had begun to develop its strength, and when slave labor in its most populous regions showed an accumulation of wealth, the expediency or non-expediency of slavery extension was raised on the question of the admission of Missouri as a State. On the particular question, slavery extension achieved a victory, but it was at the same time stipulated that thereafter all States formed out of territory north of 36° 30′ should be forever free. This was a compromise intended to be practically equal in its proportions. Freedom was to go northward untrammelled, and was to have equality and an open field to form States with or without slavery southward.

The Louisiana purchase, and that of the Floridas, while wholly unwarranted by any clause in the Constitution, had greatly augmented the political power of the slaveholding States. Geographical and commercial arguments induced a general acquiescence. Sectional domination was not then apprehended. Such a thing as forcing slavery upon an unwilling people, as has been resolutely attempted in Kansas, no madmen suggested, as no statesmen would have palliated.

Since the growth of our country, at the expense of Mexico, the doctrine of non-intervention has been upheld by the Democratic party, and in 1854 the Missouri compromise was repealed. With a license thus obtained in behalf of slavery, guided by the executive administration, protected by way side decisions squeezed from a court by party pressure, and re enforced by the arms of regular troops and of lawless men, non-intervention broke down at the start, and its first fruits in Kansas prove unsatisfactory. Curiously-worded theories, by which the thing to be done has been artfully concealed, are now to be discarded. Nothing will relieve the exigency of the great Democratic party now, but an unequivocal declaration that slavery is a blessing, and must therefore be protected by every branch of the Government. The Democracy that does not come up to this standard is to be cast off as worthless, and if the Democratic party cannot conquer under this sign, then the Union itself is to be cast off. A free charter for slavery to travel into all the Territores, and to be there protected, is the only condition upon which the Democratic party will refrain from suicide and treason. Across Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, into the Territory of Nebraska, Virginia claims the right to take her slaves. And not only into Nebraska, but into all other Territories, slavery is to go unchallenged. Thus, at first, slavery was wrong, and all our territory was to be free; then it continued wrong north of 36° 30′, and south of that, no questions were to be asked, but slavery and freedom were to be joint occupants. This was a sort of half-and-half compromise. Now, slavery is claimed to be a blessing, and all our Territories are demanded to furnish future and progressive homes for its increase. Freedom was at first made secure in its home, with a chance for the reclamation of some part of the domains of slavery. Now the position is to be reversed. Slavery is secure at home, and it is to have an open field for aggression in all the national Territories. To this complexion it has come at last, and just here we do not propose to follow Democratic leaders.

We are opposed to the dogma that the Constitution of our country, of its own inherent force, carries slavery into all the Territories. We deny that the flag of our country is to be used wherever it floats to plant and scatter an institution to which more than two-thirds of our people, it may be, are irreconcilably hostile, and whose whole moral instincts and entire economical interests would be thereby disre-

garded. That would be using our noble banner with the stars blotted out. Slavery is an anomaly. It may be a necessity in the South, but to the civilized world it is a necessity that excites profound regret. Outside of State limits, it is not a necessity, and there it is to be controlled by the nation as a whole, not by "the guilty bent of a *local* appetite." It has ever been a local institution, and therein will be found its true and only ramparts of defence. Its obscurity, not prominence, should be its stoutest shield. When it pushes itself beyond its own limits, then it encounters new perils. It is then only that it is thrust under the legal cognizance of outsiders. No one of the statesmen of the better days of the Republic ever dreamed of claiming protection for slavery, except in the States where it legally existed, and for the few sporadic cases of fugitives escaped from service. Within our own boundaries, no one thought of making conquests to enlarge its area, nor were foreign conquests entertained for any similar purpose. It was left for a party calling itself Democratic to set forth these high pretensions in behalf of an institution not even named in the Constitution.

It is a mistake to suppose the South could be rid of all anti-slavery agitation, if the North were to padlock its lips and repress all expression of head or heart on the subject. Slavery, if the North were to turn its eyes from it, must still remain visible to a larger audience, one more critical and less kindly, comprising the whole enlightened nations of the earth, from whose jurisdiction there can be no appeal and no escape. It is not the weight of public sentiment nor of the public press in the Northern States which alone bears upon slavery, but all Christendom is pervaded by the same fanaticism. There is no veil thick enough to hide the stain on the face of the Republic. While the South, in view of its increased pecuniary sanctions, may have become stronger in the faith of the propriety of slavery, the world exclusive of our own limits has been steadily marching in the opposite direction, until even the despotisms of ages refuse longer to bear such a reproach.

Secession and a Chinese wall along Mason and Dixon's line would not shield the South from philosophy, literature, political economy, law, morals, and religion, hostile to their favorite institution of slavery, unless indeed they are ready for that non-intercourse which can only be perfect in a state of barbarism, and of which China and Japan are the most conspicuous but receding examples. Among European nations, Spain alone, undistinguished except for its follies, lends countenance to slavery by its retention in Cuba, and here it is more than probable that her *poverty*, and not her *will*, consents.

This public opinion of the world cannot be imprisoned nor shut out. It is as all-pervading as the atmosphere. But this opinion proposes no political action. It has no power of coercion, and little hope of persuasion. In harmony with this anti-slavery sentiment, as the North confessedly is, the position of absolute non-interference with slavery in the States is as fixed there as it is in any foreign State. They will not only not invade slave States themselves, but they stand ready to fulfil all their constitutional obligations, by repelling invasion, from whatever quarter it may come. But, ready to do this, they will not be invaded.

Even if the Southern States were now narrowed and belted together as a unit, under a flag recognising slavery as universal, and rampant for its peaceable or forcible extension, there would be speedily found a lack, even there, of entire homogeneousness. Equality having been established, individual liberty could not be entirely suppressed. The strong shades of difference existing in the thoughts and modes of action of the human mind will have vent wherever even the *form* of a republican government exists. The contents and the progressives are implanted in all communities. The minority might be despicable in numbers, but it would inevitably spring forth to confront the absolute and aggressive positions of the majority. The difference of soil and climate, creating diverse systems of husbandry; the varied density of population, changing the value of labor, would in the space of one generation create at least all that discordance of interests in the new combination which has arisen among the old thirteen States. The wave of the slave population would set towards those points where it could be most advantageously employed, leaving bare the borders which security most requires should be covered. Islands of the free would rise even in such an ocean of slavery.

This view is sustained by Jefferson's remarkable letter to John Taylor, dated January 1, 1796, wherein he observes:

"But if, on temporary superiority of the one 'party, the other is to resort to a scission of the 'Union, no Federal Government can ever ex-'ist. If, to rid ourselves of the present rule of 'Massachusetts and Connecticut, we break the 'Union, will the evil stop there? Suppose 'the New England States alone cut off, will 'our natures be changed? Are we not men 'still to the south of that, and with all the pas-'sions of men? Immediately, we shall see a 'Pennsylvania and a Virginia party arise in 'the residuary Confederacy, and the public 'mind will be distracted by the same party 'spirit. What a game, too, will the one party 'have in their hands, by eternally threatening 'the other, that unless they do so and so, they 'will join their Northern neighbors. If we re-'duce our Union to Virginia and North Caro-'lina, immediately the conflict will be estab-'lished between the representatives of these 'two States, and they will end by breaking 'into their simple units."

In a succeeding portion of the same letter, he says:

"Seeing that we must have somebody to 'quarrel with, I had rather keep our New 'England associates for that purpose, than to 'see our bickerings transferred to others."

Other causes of dissension, likely to be aggravated, and not as now restrained by a unity of history, interest, and destiny, might be grouped—such as commercial revolutions, revulsions, and rivalries: the dethronement of cotton by the hitherto *pretenders* in India and Africa; the large standing armies that must arise to be supported by a smaller Power, with exposed frontiers, and which could not afford to stand disarmed and unprepared for emergencies; questions of free trade, or of protection to the first blossoms of manufactures; the collisions of foreign intercourse or of border feuds. But the subjects of strife are not only endless, but obvious.

If, with only 300,000 slaves in our country, and with only few and mild statutes made to hold them in subjection, men in their midst were found *then*, depicting the institution as abhorrent to all the laws of nature, is it improbable *now*, when there are probably 4,100,000 slaves, and when the slave codes have multiplied rigors to compel absolute submission, that other men would be found upon the same ground, drawing the same pictures and uttering the same sentiments, only with an added tint and accumulated emphasis?

It is quite clear that secession, if practicable on the part of the Southern States, would not prove an escape from what they esteem as heterodox opinions upon the subject of slavery, nor would it be an avoidance or even a postponement of grievances now supposed to exist. This agitation comes from the inherent energy and ardent love of liberty which cannot be wholly eradicated from any portion of the Anglo-Saxon race. It may be a fault of their blood, but, if so, it is not desirable that it should be entirely cured. When a people reach that Utopian dream of the South, where all agitation is banished, and where all criticism is silenced, they will indeed have reached that perfect equality, that stolid acquiescence, where property in slaves will everywhere be recognised, for there all will be slaves.

The only mode by which agitation can be quieted is for all parties to abandon slavery extension. I say all parties, not meaning to include the Republican, already arrayed, because all fragments of the late Democratic party treat any project of extension with hospitality. Some aim at it directly, and declare for a slave code. Others, more adroit, would defer all explicit avowal of their principles until after election, and, while claiming the right, are willing to trust the future for its enforcement. The squatter-sovereignty party have no scruples about the extension, but it is inconvenient to be caught voting for it directly. They only vote for somebody who they know will vote for it.

But in spite of the battles of the Little Giants among the Democratic party, there is one leading measure of slavery extension—the acquisition of Cuba and Mexico—wherein nearly all its members are harmonious and equally clamorous. Although the Northern allies conceal the nest of serpents under the feathers of the "Spread Eagle," this is a grave question, and deserves to be tested in the crucible of facts and figures.

The area of the United States, at the peace of 1783, was 820,680 square miles. The Louisiana purchase in 1803 (of 899,579 square miles) more than doubled it, and very largely extended the domains of slavery and slave States. The acquisition of Florida, in 1819, adding 66,900 square miles to Southern preponderance, was a movement in the same direction. The admission of Texas, in 1844, increased slave territory by over 300,000 square miles, adding one slave State to the Union at once, with a germinating power of four more, and securing, by the terms of the treaty, their future admission into the Union. Though Mexico was indignant at this dismemberment of her territory, we soon taught her that to complain was to invoke a deeper cut upon her domains, and the war of conquest in 1847 added 522,955 square miles more to our territory, into a large part of which slavery has been already introduced, and, practically, fully protected. All these movements have been made with immense cost to the National Treasury to extend our boundaries southward, while no effort has been made to extend the "area of freedom" northward, but, on the contrary, *there* our picket-guards have been driven in, and our limits curtailed. With a weak Power we quarrel for the ninth part of a hair, but with England not for an empire. If Democracy is to be credited for gains, let it be charged for losses.

Our whole area at the present time is 2,936,166 square miles—nearly as much as all Europe—and yet we are urged to all sorts of violence and wrong, diplomatic corruption and piratical invasion, even at the peril of our own domestic peace and harmony, to augment our already unwieldy dominions!

Although our population has increased eightfold since 1790, the number of persons to a square mile of territory has not doubled. The free States may expect some additions to their numbers from the Territories of Nebraska, Washington, and so forth, large in dimensions, but, on account of soil and climate, destined to a sparse population. For all purposes of settlement, the free States, with an estimated population of twenty millions in 1860, will be restricted to one-third of the area of the Republic; while the slave States, with only an estimated population of eight millions, or twelve millions, including slaves, in 1860, will have the large

vantage of two thirds of the fertile land of the country. When we look at the density of the population of the slave States, we find it, in 1850, 11.35 to the square mile, and only 21.91 to the square mile in the free States; showing, whatever may be their requirements, that the former have double the room compared with the space left to the latter. Beyond this, if we look at the land in use, we find the Southern and Southwestern States have unimproved land to double the amount of their improved land; while the New England and Middle States reverse the figures, and have improved nearly double the quantity left unimproved. In other words, in 1850, the former States had 94,942,052 acres unimproved land, and the latter only 23,429,581 acres. The proportion of improved land to the whole in the slave States was but a fraction over ten per cent.

These facts show how baseless is the claim of the South for more territory, and, if not baseless, how much greater the occasion for arresting an institution whose demands are so imperious and unceasing. The density of the population in England is 322 to the square mile, and even in Russia (in Europe) it is 28 to the square mile, or about four times as great as it is in the United States and its Territories. Give to the United States a population equal in density to that of England, and we should outnumber the supposed population of the entire world. If, then, with only about 11 to the square mile, the slaveholding States are in danger of suffocation, several grave questions arise: and among them, first, whether "the highest type of civilization," as it is gravely claimed, is to be found in States whose prosperity is based upon a large influx of slaves, and whose most-to-be-dreaded evil is a large influx of freemen; second, whether slavery is possible without the power of indefinite expansion; third, whether our neighbors have any territory which we can appropriate. According to my convictions, a higher system of culture of the soil and a greater number of inhabitants—where the church holds communion with the school-house, and where the plow, the loom, and the anvil, are all harmoniously at work—would soon exhibit a civilization more to be appreciated than that to which Southern States are now so intensely devoted.

It must be conceded, to the second query, that there is a point when slavery becomes unprofitable from the density of the population—when land becomes too valuable to support anything but freemen—and then slavery must recede; but this point must be considered far too remote to inspire any very lively apprehension or hope in the present or succeeding generation.

To the last query, it is to be observed, that Mexico now contains a population of nearly equal density to that of the United States, and Cuba a density far greater, or not less than fifty to the square mile. Acquisitions from such quarters would accelerate the very evil sought to be postponed. The conclusion is reached, therefore, that it is not for the escape and gradual disappearance of slavery that fresh fields are sought, as was urged at the time of the annexation of Texas, nor is it the dread of aggravating the density of slavery, but it is exclusively in the behalf of a re-enforcement of sectional political power. It is not an exodus of slavery that is wanted, but such a diffusion in Mexico as will furnish an increased representation of political power in the United States Senate. It is not to build up American power against European dangers that Cuba is panted after, but to create that notable equality in the Union through which eight million of people shall balance and check-mate twenty million. It is a problem of political geography, which seeks how to pack four million of slaves where they will have no less importance than twelve million of freemen, or the excess of the free over the slave-State population. And when the North opposes this, her sons are called sectional, and not conservative!

Notwithstanding all the facts of present numbers and present extent of domain, proving, while the free States neither need nor urge expansion or distribution, that the slaveholding States require it still less; notwithstanding the large and repeated acquisitions of territory for the almost exclusive benefit of slavery, notwithstanding the advantages of a milder climate and superior fertility of soil, the slaveholders now claim the right to enter with their slaves as property, and thus monopolize any and all the Territories of the United States. The claim is one of monstrous injustice, contrary to the precedents of all our early history, and, whatever may be the consequences, will never be conceded. The inclusion of the free transit of slaves as property into any Territory is in fact tantamount to the exclusion of all free-State men. The purpose is to exclude free-State men. This cannot be denied, because it is sectional power that is sought, which can be in no other way obtained, and without this result the prime object would suffer defeat. For the purposes of emigration or colonization, the necessities of the free States would appear to be the most pressing—even without considering the influx of foreign population here annually distributed. In 1850, there were living outside of the States of their birth, 720,499 persons born in New England, or more than one-fourth part of the entire population had emigrated. Add to these their descendants, and the whole would perhaps equal the population still retained.

The older States South are also drained by the more profitable fields of the Southwestern States, and sometimes they are even tempted by more Northern fields. The pressure of the slave States for more room will not be until

the population shall have multiplied six-fold, according to the facts recorded in the history of our own States, and that of other nations where slavery at one period has prevailed, and subsequently vanished. This period may be hastened by a system of agriculture which diminishes the fertility of the soil, or it may be retarded by the culture of tea, wine, and silk, or by the establishment of manufacturing and mechanical industry. The encouragement of a diversity of labor, by the employment of skilled artisans at home, instead of those abroad, would avoid the necessity of any schemes for further accessions of territory for ages to come.

The old States cannot hope to recover the relative power they once enjoyed. Their sons have gone forth over the mountains, upon the prairies and savannas, and power rapidly glides into their hands; but this day, Virginia has, beyond her own Representatives in Congress, a representation from six States, or eight members. Vermont has seven members from an equal number of States, and has had more. In 1830, it is stated there were thirty members in Congress born in the State of Connecticut. The power of the old States is thus not altogether lost, but intertwined, as it is, among the new, it links all together by an influence as fraternal as it is inflexible. Nor will any State have reason to exclaim, wherever the wanderers may reappear,

> "How sharper than a serpent's tooth it is,
> To have a thankless child."

Ingratitude to the land of our birth is simply an impossible crime.

Twenty-eight million of freemen are of more consideration than four million of slaves, and their welfare and future destiny may be *first* studied without incurring an imputation of crime or a lack of nationality. Upon economical grounds, upon the basis of the highest interests of our common country, regarding the future career of the grandest Republic to which the world has given birth, and even without hostility to the institution of slavery *per se*, which we do not deny, we may object to the further extension of slavery. Without suggesting anything invidious, we may prefer the growth and wealth of Maine to that of Florida. We may prefer the growth and wealth, the elements of power and prosperity, of Illinois or Iowa to that of Arkansas or Mississippi, though the latter are advancing at no mean pace.

In 1800, the population of the State of Virginia was 880,200. Illinois then had none, but in 1850, Illinois had 851,470. Now they have nearly equal numbers, or over 1,600,000 each, showing that while Virginia doubled her numbers by a toil of sixty years, Illinois does about the same thing in ten years! The data of strength or weakness of a State, as it contributes to or subtracts from the national support and defence, is a legitimate topic for the statesman.

I do not press the argument that slavery is wrong in itself to the conscience of Southern men, though the argument from the paucity of Democrats is not invalid in the North, because I know that conscience is steeled against all such appeals. I would as soon call upon Pius IX to surrender his temporal power, when I know his religion offers absolution for all his political sins. Besides, the moral as well as the political question is remitted by the Constitution to the States where slavery exists, and national jurisdiction and responsibility can be evoked only by the efforts made to extend it beyond those limits, where it might remain peaceably at anchor until Southern policy and Southern conscience should proclaim it an evil too great for longer endurance.

The proportions of our country are already so magnificent as to make the experiment of self-government a bold one, and more incongruous additions could only make the experiment extra-hazardous. But notwithstanding the vastness of our present territorial limits, no serious disturbance would arise touching slavery, if it were not the manifest destiny of the Democratic party, should it be able to maintain itself in power, to nationalize slavery at home, and then to seek fresh acquisitions from foreign nations for the declared purpose of enlarging its boundaries. Senator Brown has frankly avowed that was his purpose in striving to obtain Cuba; and whether avowed or not, it is too obvious to be denied. Cuba is already stocked with slaves. It is not wanted, as it cannot be used, as an outlet for the present slave population of the South. It may be wanted as a depot of a cheaper supply, to be replenished by increased clandestine facilities, but it is *most* wanted to augment the slave representation in the Government.

If these were not insuperable objections, there are other arguments against further acquisitions of territory and foreign inhabitants. Our Government is founded upon the intelligence and virtue of the people, and there is no other basis which can make Democracy or Republicanism possible for a day. Our theory has no inherent vitality which makes it practical in Asia or South America. It is the character of our people which supports our form of government. Destroy that character, or dilute it until it has lost its savor, and the nation will decline and fall as have those in other times. Under the maxims of Democratic teachers, leading astray to the worship of false gods, the standard of public virtue even now ranges none too high. It is not necessary to point out the fatal defects in the character of Cubans or Mexicans, to show their utter unfitness as associates upon a footing of equality in the Union. The sudden melting of all the accumulated ice of the arctic regions would not more certainly disturb the equilibrium of the poles than would the admission of the hybrid races of Central America, Cuba, and Mexico, disturb the harmonious and regular action of our Gov-

ernment. However we rhetorically gravitate toward these nations, there is and can be no assimilation of character. To accept them as equals, would be a concession, dragging after it our own degradation—or a copartnership where the new partners contribute weakness, ignorance, and superstition. They might indeed afford places of refuge for disappointed ambition—the rejected culls of a political campaign—but it would hardly be beneficent in a hot climate to introduce a new race of vermin. In these countries, individuals may be found of rare virtues and rare accomplishments; but the mass are untrained by education, and disqualified by habits and prejudices for the adoption of American ideas and the American forms of government. We already have New Mexico and Utah on our hands. Does any one think it would be sound policy to make these Territories the peers of Tennessee and Kentucky, or of Pennsylvania and Ohio? Whatever we may do with these—and I would treat them fairly—for we took them against their will—let us have no more territory to hold in pupilage or by chastisement. It will require all the wisdom our country will be likely to send to Congress to manage our present possessions. If there is any superabundant statesmanship in any section, let it first solve our own domestic problems, before it seeks new worlds to conquer. The true elements of greatness, strength, wealth, and glory, do not arise alone from vastness. An ingot of gold would contain no more intrinsic value, though it should be spread over the vaulted sky. The Government of the United States will not occupy a more enduring place in history by that species of aggrandizement which brings only numbers and extent. Certainly, no honor can be acquired under any pretext by which the spoliation of weaker neighbors shall be accomplished.

Extension of territory weakens patriotic sentiments. National boundaries become indistinct and confused. They do not comprehend historical objects, loved and revered by all, but novelties which beguile for the day. Every accession makes us love the Union less, and sections more.

The idea that the South require any more territory for legitimate purposes is excluded by the very general desire manifested there for the reopening of the African slave trade. This proves they have already more land than they can stock with slave labor, not less than it proves a desire to avoid the expense of rearing such stock from childhood. That there is a South side view of this great question is clear, from the exultant tone of Senator Hammond, as exhibited in his speech of March 4, 1858:

"If we never acquire," says he, "another 'foot of territory for the South, look at her—'eight hundred and fifty thousand square miles. 'As large as Great Britain, France, Austria, 'Prussia, and Spain. Is not that territory 'enough to make an empire that shall rule the 'world?"

Whatever may be done in the future, he even proclaims the extent of the subjection of the North in the past, and says, "that we, the 'slaveholders of the South, took our country in 'her infancy; and after ruling her for sixty out 'of seventy years of her existence, we shall surrender her to you without a stain upon her 'honor," &c.

This ruling, it is to be marked, is claimed in behalf of the "*slaveholders of the South*" only, and it is to be confessed that the claim is not groundless. Look at the facts:

Since the organization of the Government, the South, with only about one-third of the entire population, has had 80 out of 134 foreign ministers; 17 out of 28 judges of the Supreme Court; 14 out of the 19 Attorney Generals; 22 out of 36 Speakers of the House; 61 out of 77 Presidents of the Senate; and there have been eighteen elections for President, in which twelve of the candidates chosen were slaveholders, and only six of them Northern men; and of these six, it must be added, four stood upon a Southern platform.

The North does not propose to go out of the Union for such facts as these; but when we are taunted with the history, and a great party proclaims a policy which is to insure a repetition of the same thing for the next seventy years, we do propose to vote it down. It would be an impeachment of our manhood to do less.

Territorial expansion is to be deplored, on the ground that it can only be accomplished by the sacrifice of the purity and simplicity which marked our character in all our earlier history.

The Louisiana purchase, as well as that of Florida, fell to our lot naturally, were unattended by any costly outlay in the extension of our jurisdiction, and did not embarrass our positions of defence. But some of the later accessions of territory, magnificent as they are in proportions, have really diminished our strength, and have so inflated our ideas of grandeur, so raised the scale of national expenditure, that we have grown to slight all economy, and deride the early manners of the Republic. The statesmanship of Franklin and Jefferson is as much out of fashion as would be their coats. The sapient cry of "this is a great country," gives license to ceaseless waste. It is too evident we cannot turn from this regal road of extravagance, while the delusive thrist for expansion is encouraged.

Prior to late acquisitions, (or 1844,) our *civil list* seldom exceeded two million dollars annually. Now, it is over seven and a half million dollars. Then, our *foreign intercourse* was carried on for about half of a million dollars. Now, its ordinary level is double that sum. Then, the cost of our *judiciary* was not much over a half million dollars. Now, it is

a plump million, with brilliant increasing prospects. Then, the expense of our *military service* was not far from five million dollars. It now reaches over nineteen million dollars, or as much as in any year of the last war with Great Britain. Our *naval* establishment, which then cost about six million dollars, is not *now* content with over twelve million dollars. Our miscellaneous expenditures, that were from two to three million dollars, are *now* eighteen to nineteen million dollars. The *Indian* department then cost about one million and a half dollars, but it has now swelled to over four million dollars. The Post Office, *then* self-supporting, now bangs upon the Treasury with a weight of millions of dollars *per annum*. Salaries of officers have been largely increased, and the pay of members of Congress has been doubled. Then, we were nearly out of debt; and now, we have a national debt of sixty million of dollars, daily increasing.

This new era of extravagance, engendering corruption in all the machinery of our Government, is the natural sequence of territorial expansion. Services are paid for, not according to their value, but in proportion to the size and means of the nation. Purchases are made, not because the Government wishes to *buy*, but because some greedy or needy Democrat wishes to sell. Unscrupulous acquisition is the vice of the nation, and the example is too illustrious not to be copied by individuals. The Democratic party, giddy in this national debauchery, panders to this appetite, and is wholly unmindful of the future cost to the integrity of our country. Economy, and all those cardinal virtues essential to the success of our form of Government, are cast away, as useless encumbrances on the grand march of expansion and absorption.

It is not for the pecuniary interests of the South that slavery should be extended and the culture of cotton increased. If

> "Mammon, the least erected spirit that fell
> From Heaven,"

is alone to be worshipped, the tables of commerce and navigation will show that a large cotton crop yields less money than a smaller one. A little excess now largely diminishes the price. A permanent increase of the supply would undoubtedly bring a permanent reduction in price. More competition would be disastrous.

The position of the Republican party as to the non-extension of slavery will not be changed or abandoned. It is the only policy worthy of a great people. It will inflict no injustice upon the South—far from it. The South will ever retain all the power and influence to which it is entitled, and most likely far more, but it will not be able to propagate the doctrine that slavery is a blessing. That must remain a local dogma, and not an eternal truth. There is such a preponderance of national sentiment against slavery extension, that no time can change it—no party reverse it—no circumstances lessen its weight. Whether slavery extension is longer possible with the aid of our Union, is a question now being brought to the test, and depending upon the supremacy of the Democratic party; but with the Union destroyed and broken into angry fragments, by secession or otherwise, that question at least is answered forever. It is not possible.

If there is any force in the argument thus far, UNION and LIBERTY *is* possible, and they will never be disjoined. It is also apparent that in the Democratic party will be found the only considerable enemies of either, and this party it is the duty of all friends of constitutional liberty to dethrone and disperse.

I think I have also shown that the discussion of slavery can never cease, while it maintains an aggressive attitude. It cannot obtain charity by reviling freedom, and will continue to be ranked as an evil so long as Christianity endures or Democracy claims anything beyond its name.

The acquisition of foreign territory—nowhere peacefully to be obtained—cannot be prosecuted without defilement of our national honor. It is moreover that forbidden fruit, sweet to the taste, but bitter in the belly, which is sure to demoralize and disrupt the Republic.

The extent of our present Territories, though large, will no more than suffice for the wants of the free white men of the country, including the sons of the Cavaliers as well as the sons of the Puritans. The field of the South, if not equal to its ambition, is even now broader than it can hope to successfully hold or profitably cultivate; but the Northern hive, busy at home, can yet spare an annual swarm to swell the hum of industry over a broader theatre. The future career, prosperity, and moral grandeur of our country depends upon placing its destinies permanently in the hands and hearts of those who have faith in the principles of the Revolutionary Fathers of the Republic.

[NOTE.—This speech was commenced on a former day, and was interrupted by Mr. Craige, of North Carolina, on a question that no quorum was present. On the 6th inst., after some further portion of the speech had been delivered, Mr. Craige again raised his point of order. After a protracted contest, the speech was resumed, but, it being then late in the night, I was unwilling to detain my friends, and therefore obtained leave to print the concluding part. The several colloquies are omitted, as it has been found impossible to include them in an hour's or eight-page speech.]

Published by the Republican Congressional Committee. Price 50 cents per hundred.